

OPINION 579

DETERMINATION OF THE TYPE-SPECIES OF THE NOMINAL GENUS
ANCILLA LAMARCK, 1799 (CLASS GASTROPODA)

RULING.—(1) The nominal genus *Ancilla* Lamarck, 1799, (Class Gastropoda) is hereby ruled to have been established without any originally included nominal species, and therefore, under the Rules as revised by the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology (Paris, 1948) (*Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 4 : 160), the first species subsequently referred to that genus, namely, *Ancilla cinnamomea* Lamarck, 1801, is the type-species of that genus, by subsequent monotypy.

(2) The generic name *Ancilla* Lamarck, 1799 (gender : feminine), type-species, by subsequent monotypy under (1) above, *Ancilla cinnamomea* Lamarck, 1801, is hereby placed on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology with the Name No. 1389.

(3) The specific name *cinnamomea* Lamarck, 1801, as published in the binomen *Ancilla cinnamomea* (type-species of *Ancilla* Lamarck, 1799) is hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology with the Name No. 1696.

HISTORY OF THE CASE. (Z.N.(S.) 170)

On 1 November 1937, Mrs. Katharine V. W. Palmer (Palaeontological Research Institution, Ithaca, N.Y., U.S.A.) requested a ruling on the question of the type-species of *Ancilla* Lamarck, 1799. Her application was eventually published on 11 May 1954 in *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 9 : 219, accompanied (: 219-220) by a paper by Mr. Hemming.

Mrs. Palmer asked whether the citation of a figure (Martini, *Conch.* 2 : pl. 65, figs. 722-724) without a name was sufficient to indicate the nominal species to which the specimen represented in that figure belonged, as the type-species of the genus. Mr. Hemming took the view that, in spite of the fact that the figure in question had been named as *Voluta ampla* by Gmelin, in 1792, and was in fact the basis of that species, *Ancilla* should be treated as a genus established without any originally included nominal species, and this was confirmed by the vote of the Commission.

After the expiry of the six-months comment-period, and after the Voting Paper on this case had been distributed to the members of the Commission, Professor J. Chester Bradley drew attention, in a letter dated 30 November 1954, to an alternative approach to this problem. He referred to the decision of the Paris Congress relating to Opinion 35 (*Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 4 : 156), whereby the type-species of a genus established prior to 1931 without an originally designated or indicated type-species could be determined from among any of the species originally included in the genus, whether then cited under a binominal name or not. In the present case, the figure of Chemnitz which was the sole basis of *Ancilla* Lamarck, 1799, had already in 1792 been given the name of *Voluta ampla* by Gmelin. Professor Chester Bradley therefore suggested that, even though Lamarck had not cited Gmelin's name, and had not even referred to his work, his species could, in the light of the Paris decision on Opinion 35,

be regarded as the type-species of *Ancilla*, because it had in effect been cited, though "not under a binominal name" (in point of fact, not by any name).

Professor Chester Bradley put forward two alternative Declarations to cover the present case, the first to provide that a species, in order to be eligible to become the type-species of a genus, must be cited by a binominal name, or by a reference to a binominal name; and the second to provide that reference to an unnamed description or figure would be sufficient to designate a species subsequently named on the basis of that description or figure as the type-species of that genus. It was clear that he himself preferred the former alternative, and in subsequent correspondence he agreed that the method whereby *Ancilla* was regarded as a genus established without originally included species was in fact preferable to that whereby it was regarded as a genus established with an included species not cited under a binominal name; and he requested that the point of principle involved should be made clear in the Ruling in which the Commission's decision was expressed (see paragraph (1) of the present Ruling). It is quite clear, however, that Professor Chester Bradley's point was a genuine matter of law, and that, owing to the indefinite wording of the Paris decision relating to Opinion 35, it was possible to regard the present case as equally subject to two conflicting provisions of the Rules.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

On 26 November 1954 the Members of the Commission were invited to vote under the Three-Month Rule, on Voting Paper (54)93 for or against the proposal relating to the generic name *Ancilla* Lamarck, 1799, set out on *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 9 : 220, paragraph 5. At the close of the Voting Period on 26 February 1955 the state of the voting was as follows :

Affirmative Votes—twenty (20), received in the following order : Holthuis, Hering, Lemche, Stoll, Vokes, Esaki, Dymond, Jaczewski, Bonnet, Hankó, Boschma, Miller, Key, do Amaral, Hemming, Bodenheimer, Riley, Cabrera, Kühnelt, Sylvester-Bradley.

Negative Votes—one (1) : Chester Bradley.

Leave of Absence—two (2) : Mertens, Prantl.

Votes not returned—none (0).

ORIGINAL REFERENCES

The following are the original references for names placed on Official Lists by the Ruling given in the present Opinion :

Ancilla Lamarck, 1799, *Mém. Soc. Hist. nat. Paris* 1 : 70

cinnamomea, *Ancilla*, Lamarck, 1801, *Syst. Anim. s. Vert.* : 73.

CERTIFICATE

WE certify that the votes cast on Voting Paper (54)93 were cast as set out above, that the proposals set out in the Voting Paper have been duly adopted, and that the decision so taken, being the decision of the International Commission, is truly recorded in the present Opinion No. 579.

N. D. RILEY

Secretary

RICHARD V. MELVILLE

Assistant Secretary

International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature

London

1 July 1959